



APRIL 2021

### **On Campus Police Forces**

In the wake of the murders of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and countless other Black people and other individuals by police, large-scale protests calling for an end to systemic racism and for the defunding of police departments, and police violence and brutality in response to those protests, the AAUP publishes this report concerning the role of campus police forces. The intended purpose of the report is threefold:

1. To provide an historical overview of the development of campus police forces that contextualizes their relatively recent existence in US higher education and their alarming rates of expansion and militarization, with particular attention to their role in perpetuating systemic racism and inequities.
2. To demonstrate the clear tensions between the AAUP's core values and the existence and function of campus police forces.
3. To urge AAUP chapters to address campus policing issues and provide guidance to help chapter leaders mount campaigns to transform campus public safety.

The report is divided into five sections and an appendix. The first section analyzes the history and development of campus police forces, emphasizing their recent expansion and role in perpetuating racial oppression and quelling dissent. The second section argues that the present form and function of campus police forces is in tension with core AAUP values and therefore urges AAUP chapters to use their power to advocate for change. The third section provides a set of questions chapter leaders should ask themselves to understand the nature of their campus police forces and what, if anything, they wish to change about them. The fourth section contains advice for chapter leaders derived from examples of AAUP chapters currently engaged in antiracist organizing and efforts to reform, disarm, defund, or abolish their campus police forces. The report concludes with suggestions for the AAUP national organization on how it can best support chapters in this work and emphasizes intersections with the AAUP's efforts to become an antiracist organization. We also include an appendix containing detailed profiles of three AAUP chapters presently organizing to transform campus public safety. We hope members will find inspiration and insight from these examples.

In order to avoid confusion and clarify our terminology, we note that our primary attention in this document is on race, specifically on the racist dynamics of campus policing that endanger BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and people of color) individuals and communities. However, we acknowledge that many people disproportionately experience police violence outside of, or in combination with, structural racism. We also know that police violence disproportionately affects people at multiple intersections of oppression, including race, immigration status, economic class, disabilities, housing status, gender, and sexual orientation, among others. Our emphasis on race should not be read to exclude other marginalized groups or persons. Throughout the document, we use the phrase “systematically marginalized communities” to refer to the wide range and complexity of people who are made less safe by the practices and expansion of campus police.

## **I. The Growth and Development of Campus Police**

Policing in its broadest sense—a function performed in one way or another by public safety officers, private security firms, and municipal police departments—is not new to the academy. The widespread creation of university police forces, however, is a recent development implemented with unprecedented rapidity and breadth (Garcia-Rojas and Rosen, 2020). They are also objects of newly energized protests on campuses across the country in the wake of the deaths of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and countless other Black people at the hands of law enforcement officers.

The first US university police force was the Yale Police Department, established with two officers in 1894. They were charged initially with keeping the unhoused people of New Haven from sheltering in university buildings (Wiser 1914; Powell 1994; Schwartz-Weinstein 2016). The current trend toward proliferation of police departments at colleges and universities has multiple roots. These include administrative concern over large-scale student protests during the 1960s and 1970s, the 1990 Clery Act that requires institutions of higher education to report on crimes that occur on and around their campuses, and the mass shooting at Virginia Tech in 2007 (Sloan 1992; Virginia Tech Review Panel 2007; Bennett 2012; Inoue 2020). The Clery Act was just one element in a cascade of federal criminal justice legislation that included the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, and the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001.

The combined effect of the late-twentieth-century pursuit of ever-tougher criminal justice policies and increasingly vast law enforcement powers (and numbers) was to manufacture a humanitarian crisis in which the United States has the most incarcerated people of any country in the world in both absolute numbers and as a percentage of its population (Alexander 2010; Richie 2012; Hinton 2016; Ritchie 2017). The “land of the free” is home to less than five percent of the world’s population, but nearly 25 percent of the world’s prisoners (Liptak 2008; Lee 2015). One in thirty-five Americans were incarcerated, on parole, or on probation in 2016—

slightly more than the combined 2010 population of Chicago and Los Angeles (Cohen, Hatchard, and Wilson 2015; Kaeble and Cowhig 2018). Yet people of color made up 70 percent of those incarcerated in 2016—ensuring structurally that many white people will remain shielded from the scope of this crisis (Kaeble and Cowhig 2018).

While many Americans are becoming increasingly aware of systemic racism in law enforcement and criminal justice in our society, the alarms have also been sounding on higher education campuses for some time. According to the US Department of Justice, 92 percent of public colleges and universities in 2012 had sworn and armed campus officers, as did 38 percent of private ones (Reaves 2015). The growth of police forces in higher education has been swift and sudden. The *Atlantic* notes that between 2005 and 2015 “the percentage of both public and private colleges nationwide using armed officers increased from 68 percent to 75 percent” (Anderson 2015).

As campus police have proliferated, so have the racist and violent impacts, in many cases resulting in death. In 2011, campus police pepper-sprayed seated student protesters at the University of California, Davis (Gordon 2011; Medina 2012). In 2013, George Washington University police officers were found to be performing illegal off-campus detentions (Gurciullo 2013; Murphy 2013). In 2015, a University of Cincinnati police officer shot and killed a Black man, Samuel DuBose (Pérez-Peña 2015; Murphy and Curnutte 2018). The same year, Yale University police pulled a gun on a Black student (Addenbrooke and Ye 2015; Blow 2015). In 2018, a University of Oregon police officer pulled a gun on a student of color, mistaking him for a white suspect (Benitez 2018; Tobin 2019). The same year, Portland State University police shot and killed a Black man, Jason Washington (Crowe 2018; Herron 2019; Flaccus 2020). Also in 2018, University of Chicago police shot a student having an apparent mental health crisis (Harris and Grieve 2018; Cherney 2018; Seidel 2020). Any college and university presidents congratulating themselves that their campus police officers have not shot or killed a student or community member should understand that it may only be a matter of time before they do.

These trends in campus policing take place within the broader structural transformation of US society. As our downtown areas and historically Black and Latinx neighborhoods have gentrified into upscale shopping and living hubs, an enlarged police presence and increased arrests for minor quality-of-life infractions have become standard operating procedure. Campus police forces have played their part in this reorganization of space, labor, and bodies. One example of this trend is the “cruise-ship university,” with university campuses becoming high-profile oases, separated sometimes only by a few feet from systemically impoverished neighborhoods, that offer up a boutique experience to undergraduates while keeping the supposed unseemly elements of urban life at a safe distance (Rodríguez 2012; Hodge 2013).

The role of campus police has not remained confined to campus. In 2012, 90 percent of sworn campus police officers had the authority to make arrests in areas near campus, and 70 percent of campus police agencies had their off-campus roles defined by signed agreements with local law enforcement (Reaves 2015). Off-campus arrests are central to the project of campus

policing, as illustrated by the fact that sworn officers on 81 percent of campuses in 2012 were responsible for off-campus patrol jurisdictions (Reaves 2015). Disturbingly, the extension of campus patrols into adjacent neighborhoods creates a loophole in local measures to keep law enforcement accountable and transparent in interactions with the public.

The ostensible mission of keeping students safe has been a Trojan horse for interlocking processes of gentrification, urban renewal, community displacement, mass incarceration, and bond issuance and securitization by public universities for large-scale construction projects. The people whom campus police target both on and off campus include members of systematically marginalized communities, local residents unaffiliated with the university (including unhoused and transient populations), student and labor activists (insubordinate members of the campus community), and members of the community traditionally understood as “criminal” (including bicycle thieves, rapists, and mass shooters) (Rodríguez 2012; Del Gandio 2013; Strong 2013; Armstrong 2015; Patten, Alward, and Thomas 2016). Tellingly, while increasing the number of campus security or campus police officers does increase the number of arrests for minor infractions, it has not been found to reduce rates of campus crime (Fox and Helman 1985; Volkwein et al. 1995; Bennett 2012).

The issues of campus sexual assault and mass shootings have been studied extensively by scholars. Sexual assault is far too common, and a quarter of undergraduate women report (and almost certainly underreport) nonconsensual sexual contact involving force or the inability to consent (Cantor et al. 2020). However, it is unclear that armed police patrols are the best way of addressing the issue. Seventy-eight percent of rape or sexual assault survivors know their attacker (Planty et al. 2016). About a third of rapes are committed by an intimate partner and an additional third are committed by a friend or acquaintance (Planty et al. 2016). It is simply not the case that police effectively address the problem of sexual assault.

Similarly, scholars have suggested that broad, systemic measures are necessary to prevent the dangers posed by potential mass shooters; however, unlike sexual assault, campus mass shootings are rare. The number of mass shootings on university campuses between 1990 and 2008 was fourteen (Fox and Savage 2009). The lack of systematic data makes it difficult to report accurately on them in more recent years, but research suggests that they remain very rare. There is no evidence that campus police prevent them (Garcia-Rosen and Rojas, 2020), and little evidence to justify such a large outlay of the campus budget. The resources allocated to police might be better directed toward measures that, as evidence suggests, really can help to prevent campus violence by active shooters and others: improved threat assessment and identification tools, additional counseling and mental-health resources for students, and better training for faculty to help them identify at-risk students and refer them to appropriate resources (Sulkowski and Lazarus 2011; Rocque 2012; Bonanno and Levenson 2014; Hollister and Scalora 2015; Johnson 2017; Linger 2018; Lankford, Adkins, and Madfis 2019; Everytown et al. 2020).

Following patterns for law-enforcement agencies nationally, police departments in higher education have continued to expand even as crime rates have fallen. They annex duties and responsibilities previously handled by student associations or other units on campus—from safe-ride programs to bicycle registration (Sloan 1992; Anderson 2015; Patten, Alward, and Thomas 2016). University police forces occupy a liminal space, sharing characteristics of municipal forces, on the one hand, and private security companies, on the other. They usually retain the duties and privileges of other sworn, public law-enforcement agencies (for example, qualified immunity from prosecution, discretion to use deadly force, and authorization to deprive others of their rights and liberty). Unlike public law-enforcement agencies, however, campus police agencies do not report to voters or to public officials (such as a city council, a mayor, a city manager, a police commission, a civilian review board, or a city auditor). Instead, their accountability is nested within the administrative hierarchy of the university—ultimately reporting to a president or a board of trustees who are neither elected nor appointed by the people who are being policed. The result is an always economically and usually racially determined dynamic in which an essentially private police force may act freely of the constraints imposed on most major municipal police agencies by independent commissions, auditors, and review boards. One fact remains so incontrovertible and yet so counter to prevailing assumptions in higher education that it bears restating: by whatever measure one chooses, campus police have not made campuses safer.

## **II. Campus Police and the AAUP**

The relatively recent expansion of campus police forces is inextricably linked to issues of systemic racism and poses several ethical and political concerns that, on their own, merit serious scrutiny from the academic profession. However, we wish to draw special attention to how the rise and function of campus police forces exists in clear tension with the AAUP's core value of ensuring that higher education serves the common good. Academic freedom and shared governance are essential to upholding that core value, but campus police are often at odds with academic freedom and shared governance.

As explicated in both the 1915 *Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* and the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, the AAUP understands academic freedom as the ability for researchers and instructors to explore and disseminate knowledge without interference by administrations, governing boards, or political powers. This freedom is especially important when the pursuit of knowledge leads a professor to conclusions or ideas that chafe against the political convictions of those in positions of power or threaten their authority. Crucially, this freedom to explore and disseminate knowledge extends to a professor's ability to share it in public fora, including when engaged in political action. As the 1940 *Statement* notes, "College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline" (AAUP 14). Faculty members often exercise their academic freedom by joining students or staff engaged in confrontational direct

actions aimed at compelling those in power to change some feature of campus policy. Campus police forces often stand in direct opposition to this freedom to explore, disseminate, and advocate controversial ideas. They are the coercive tool of campus administrators, and they preemptively stifle dissenters through their armed and organized presence on campus.

Furthermore, once dissent evolves into confrontational actions, campus police are empowered to arrest or otherwise coerce dissenting students, faculty, staff, and community members into compliance with the desires of the administration. Such intimidation and threats of violence intersect with broader trends of police violence directed toward systematically marginalized communities, reproducing systemic racism and classism and its attendant forms of violence on marginalized students and faculty members who are often outspoken critics of the administration because they suffer from the racist dynamics that campus police forces perpetuate. Campus police have also been used by administrations to try and intimidate, coerce, or even use force against faculty and graduate employee unions (Garcia-Rojas and Rosen). Campus police forces thus exist in clear tension with the core AAUP value of academic freedom because their function as the administration's coercive force inhibits advocacy of ideas that threaten the authority of those in power and reproduces reprehensible racist violence against marginalized students, faculty, and staff.

While the presence and function of campus police forces exists in tension with the principle of academic freedom, the ways they are funded, controlled, and overseen often run afoul of the AAUP's commitment to shared governance. According to the AAUP *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*, faculty have "primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum . . . and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process," and, even in areas outside of faculty primary responsibility, there should still be "agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university" (AAUP 120–21). Campus police may not fall directly under the primary responsibility of faculty, but faculty should still play a role in their oversight, accountability, and policy making. Generally, however, campus police forces are ultimately accountable only to the university president and the governing board. This poses two related problems. First, unlike municipal police forces, which are ultimately accountable to elected officials and therefore to voters, a university president is an unelected figure appointed by a governing board. Public safety on campus is therefore in the hands of an individual who is not accountable to the university's "public" of staff, faculty, and students. This problem of public oversight is only exacerbated when campus police forces arrest and investigate reports of criminal activity outside of campus boundaries, or when municipal police are called on to do the same within a campus, further confusing lines of accountability.

Second, and related to the issue of public accountability, is the perennial struggle over finances and which aspects of the college or university's mission are prioritized through funding. Campus police force budgets have, in general, only increased over time, and their departments are often protected from budget cuts that are imposed on academic departments, effectively undercutting the primary educational mission of the institution in favor of expanding the administration's police force (Reaves 2008 and 2015; Armstrong 2015; National Center for

Campus Public Safety 2018; Calisch 2020). Campus police forces thus pose a threat to the principle of shared governance because they are not accountable to faculty and the campus community in any direct or meaningful way, and they often directly compete with academic units for scarce financial resources, attenuating what the AAUP views as the core purpose of higher education: research and teaching.

These problems of unaccountability and resource depletion put campus police forces in opposition to the AAUP's fundamental value of ensuring that higher education serves the public good. Campus police forces are not immune to the racist dynamics of US public life, and, in a moment of widespread democratic reckoning with the thoroughly racist history of US law enforcement and its ongoing effects, colleges and universities should be spaces that allow us to imagine new approaches to public safety. The AAUP does not claim to have an easy answer or formulaic policy remedy to undo the racial inequities and injustices perpetrated by policing. However, the current state of policing is in clear tension with the ideals of a free and fair democratic society in which marginalized faculty, staff, students, and community members should not fear violence from agents charged with their protection. Campus police forces currently disserve the public good because they are not subject to public pressure from campus communities, they function to repress dissent that might make them more accountable to those communities, and they threaten the safety and freedom of BIPOC community members through their presence and increasing militarization.

Because of the dubious history of campus police forces and their incongruity with core AAUP values of academic freedom, shared governance, and higher education for the public good, we believe it is consistent with the mission of the AAUP to pursue efforts, both at the chapter and national levels, to transform campus public safety. We now turn to concrete steps AAUP chapters can take if their members wish to prioritize this work.

### **III. Understanding Campus Context**

In this section we raise several questions for chapter leaders and members to consider as a first step toward understanding, and ultimately changing, the nature of public safety on campus. We organized these questions knowing that there cannot be a one-size-fits-all approach to organizing around this issue, and they are written in such a way that they are relevant to a variety of goals. Where a chapter should start will depend on the political situation on its campus, the dynamics of the campus police force, the will of chapter members, and what other organizations on campus and in the community are doing.

These questions will be most useful for chapters that are just beginning their efforts to understand the origins and dynamics of their campus police forces. In these times of heightened awareness of institutional racism and police violence, faculty members may want to engage with these issues, but they often know little about the contexts on their own campuses.

These questions can help identify gaps in knowledge and enable chapters to determine how they can best leverage their power to transform campus public safety.

The questions are divided into four major categories: 1) understanding the context of your campus police force; 2) identifying the range of opinions and level of knowledge among your members; 3) mapping out potential allies and partners on campus and in the broader community; and 4) questions to stimulate thinking about possible alternatives for ensuring campus safety. We recommend that chapter leaders take the time to work together to answer these questions prior to building a larger organizing campaign.

### ***Fact Finding and Context of Your Campus Police Force***

#### *History of Campus Security and Police*

- What is the history of policing on your campus, going back decades? What is the broader context of the decisions to establish a campus police form and to arm officers?
- What was your institution's approach to campus public safety prior to the creation of a formal campus police force? What were the reasons given at the time for the need to change? Is your campus safer since the change took place? How is safety measured?

#### *Transparency, Oversight, and Accountability*

- To whom do campus police typically report? To whom are they accountable? Are faculty members involved in oversight? In what ways and to what degree?
- How much money does your campus spend on police? Where do the funds for campus police come from? How is the money spent? What is the overall trend in spending on campus police in the last decade?
- Are campus police required to publish handbooks and policy documents that explain their procedures and tactics? Are their operations transparent to all members of the campus community? Is there community input on police policies and procedures?
- What safeguards exist to ensure the legitimacy of criminal investigations by campus police, especially in high-profile cases in which unelected and unaccountable administrators have a conflict of interest?
- What is the mechanism for filing and tracking complaints regarding police behavior on or off campus? Who investigates these complaints? Are investigations reviewed by anyone external to the police department? Are there regular audits of complaints and investigations? What have been the results of complaints filed in the past decade?
- Do your campus police track their use of force? Are use-of-force records easily accessible to the public? How frequently have your campus police used force—including deadly force—in the past decade? Are the trends for use of force increasing or decreasing?
- Have there been complaints against campus police for discriminatory treatment of BIPOC students, staff, or faculty members or other systematically marginalized community members? Where can you find comprehensive reports of these complaints and how have they been investigated?

#### *Safety Issues on Campus and Campus Police Activity*



- What are the main safety and security issues on campus?
- What types of incidents do campus police most frequently respond to on or off campus?
- How have they responded?

#### *Police Hiring and Training*

- What type of training do campus police receive, both before and at the beginning of their employment, and on an ongoing basis?
- Does your institution have requirements around the diversity of their police leadership and staff? If so, who developed these policies and what body oversees their implementation?
- Do campus police have to address racism, misogyny, and other forms of bias? What does this look like?

#### *Police Weapons and Authority*

- Do campus police regularly carry firearms or other, less lethal weapons? Which kinds? Do they have access to other weapons for exceptional circumstances? What policies regulate their use of weapons? Can campus police use tear gas? What is the history of their use of (lethal and less lethal) weapons?
- What is the campus, local, and state policy in terms of open-carry and concealed-carry firearms in public or on campus? How recent is that policy?
- Do your campus police possess surplus military equipment such as armored vehicles, assault rifles, or grenade launchers? Have they received counterterrorism training? If so, who made the decisions to acquire this equipment or training?
- Do campus police policies include restrictions on the use of force such as banning chokeholds, strangleholds, and shooting at moving vehicles or fleeing suspects? Do they require de-escalation, warning before shooting, and comprehensive incident reporting?
- Are campus police allowed to question, detain, or arrest people for violating college policies? How are campus police deployed during campus protests? Are there specific university policies regarding their use during demonstrations, strikes, and protests? Have campus police intimidated faculty members and staff who were trying to organize a union or engaging in a strike on campus?

#### *Unions and Contracts*

- Do your campus police have a union? If so, are campus police in a bargaining unit with other types of workers (for example, administrative staff or service workers)? What authority negotiates contracts with them? Is their contract available for review? What is in it? How often are contracts negotiated?

#### *Relationships with Other Police Forces*

- Does your university or college have contracts, mutual support agreements, or formal relationships with other law enforcement agencies (whether city, county, state, or federal)? What do those contracts and relationships include? Do they require campus police to respond to law enforcement needs off campus?
- In what ways, and in what instances, have campus and other police forces interacted over the past decade?

### ***Identifying the Range of Perspectives among Chapter Leaders and Members along a Continuum of Reform to Abolition***

- What are the perspectives of faculty, staff, and students that are unfairly targeted by police, such as BIPOC and other systematically marginalized persons? What can you, as a chapter, do to center these perspectives in discussions around campus police?
- What is the level of understanding among chapter members regarding the history of policing and systemic racism?
- What are the perspectives of chapter members on these issues, along a continuum ranging from maintaining the status quo to pursuing reform or abolition?
- Do any of your chapter's members possess expertise in the history of policing? If so, how might you tap into this expertise to inform your chapter's discussion?

#### ***Possible Partners and Allies on Campus and in the Broader Community***

- Are there student organizations, labor unions, or other community groups who have taken an interest in changing campus public safety? If so, who are the leaders of these groups and how can you get into contact with them?
- What is the position of student government regarding campus police? What role, if any, do they play in oversight and accountability?
- Are there BIPOC-led or antiracist organizations on campus pushing for changes to campus policing? If so, are any of your chapter's members involved in these efforts?

#### ***Identifying Alternatives for Campus Safety***

- How can we think of campus safety and security more broadly than the model of an armed police force? Are there alternative proposals already circulating from community or student organizations?
- Would your campus be better served by having safety and security officers, perhaps in the form of crisis responders who are unarmed and do not have the power to arrest people or conduct criminal investigations?
- Would your college or university be better off spending money on other public-safety programs, such as crisis-support services or counseling? If so, what are some programs with demonstrated ability to improve public safety? How might your chapter work to implement similar programs?
- How can your campus comply with the reporting requirements of the Clery Act without an armed police force?

### **IV. Guidance for Chapter Organizing**

In the previous section, we identified some questions that can assist chapters in gaining knowledge and identifying possible areas for action. This section provides some initial guidance to AAUP chapters that wish to build coalitions and organize against police on their campuses. The guidance was informed by conversations with leaders of three AAUP chapters that are engaged with the issue of campus police in relation to systemic racism: the California Faculty Association (CFA), Portland State University AAUP (PSU-AAUP), and University of Vermont United Academics (UVM UA). See Appendix A for detailed profiles of the chapters and their

efforts. Other chapters are involved in similar efforts, and we suggest that the national AAUP do more to collect and share those efforts so chapters can learn from one another.

Each AAUP chapter is unique and operates in its own particular context. Chapters vary in terms of type (advocacy or collective bargaining), location, size, strength, and staffing. Furthermore, their campuses vary with regard to the history and status of campus security, the relationship between campus security and other security forces (for example, municipal, county, and state police), local safety concerns, demographic diversity, unique characteristics of the campus community, and overall attitudes toward policing, abolition, and racial justice. As such, each chapter must assess its context and develop a thoughtful organizing plan around the issue of campus security. Below we offer some guidance, organized to follow the potential order of an organizing campaign.

### **1. Figure out your campus context.**

Do some fact finding and gain understanding of your campus context as it relates to policing. Our list of questions in the previous section will be a great starting point. Consider gaining insight through focus groups, surveys, public forums, or other outreach efforts.

### **2. Engage and organize members across a range of perspectives.**

AAUP chapters can engage and organize members in a variety of ways (as is true with collective bargaining or issue campaigns):

- Understand the range of perspectives held by members by conducting a survey, holding focus groups or listening sessions, and engaging in one-on-one conversations.
- Seek out the perspectives and insight of campus community members who have scholarly expertise and lived experience on relevant topics, including scholars with expertise in antiracist scholarship, alternatives to policing and security, or the criminal justice system; campus staff who work with community members who are unhoused, have addiction or mental-health issues, or have been harmed by sexual or interpersonal violence; and campus members from communities systemically targeted by the police or who have had adverse interactions with campus security.
- Recognize that members have a range of viewpoints on this issue, and that disagreement is a normal part of all organizing. AAUP chapters are a space for discussion and dissent.
- Engage and listen to members who may have concerns about the campaign or strong commitments to a police presence on campus. Try to help them see the connections between AAUP values and campus policing. Members' viewpoints may change, especially with the surge in media attention to police brutality and social movements that advocate for defunding or reforming police departments.
- View this as an organizing opportunity for your chapter to gain new members or activate members who have not been deeply engaged before, especially those who are members of communities disproportionately targeted by police.

- Educate. As an example, the CFA presented research about policing on campus and has hosted educational events for members as a way to build consensus.

### 3. **Build relationships with other organizations and allies.**

Other organizations are already working on these issues. AAUP chapters will be stronger in their efforts to address campus security by collaborating with other on-campus and local organizations. Chapters can support other groups' efforts by providing scholarly expertise and mentoring related to organizing and activism, using their authority to elevate demands to faculty and administration, and participating in student- and community-led events.

Chapters must recognize that other organizations may have differing ideas about campus safety. Thus, chapters must be prepared to re-evaluate where their demands overlap or might be in tension with the demands of other groups in order to understand to what extent they can work together. They will need to consider when to change positions and if this is worth doing.

Possible collaborators include the following:

- Students and student organizations. At some universities and colleges, student-led organizations are the most organized and vocal around these issues. For example, PSU-AAUP has collaborated with the Disarm PSU coalition, which was initiated mainly by students active in the Portland State University Student Union.
- Community-based social justice organizations. AAUP chapters will gain strength and viability by collaborating with social justice organizations that are mobilizing to defund the police or as part of the Movement for Black Lives. For example, some of the leaders in the CFA's work on policing are also leaders in their local Black Lives Matter chapters and have activated those relationships to strengthen the shared targets of their advocacy and organizing efforts.
- Labor unions on campus or local and regional labor organizations, such as the AFL-CIO.
- Faith-based groups, such as mosques, synagogues, or churches.

### 4. **Make clear demands.**

For chapter advocacy and organizing work to resonate with members and have support over the long term as leaders change, it is critical that efforts toward campus security be connected to and integrated with a broader platform of work on anti-oppression, social justice, shared governance, academic freedom, and more. Besides being tied to other work, chapter efforts on policing must also be focused on a clear set of demands aimed at decision makers. Below are a few more specific ideas and examples of a strategic plan of action.

- Develop specific, concrete, and clear demands based on earlier steps. Be bold and unequivocal. Disarm PSU, which PSU-AAUP collaborates with, had a very clear demand

(implied in their title) to disarm their campus police. CFA [published a set of demands in summer](#) 2020, including a demand to “Defund and Remove Armed & Militarized Policing from Campus.”

- Connect disarmament work to the AAUP’s mission and values (as described above). Build on the recent AAUP commitment toward becoming an antiracist institution.
- Deepen your chapter’s commitment to racial equity and justice, which will enable you to contextualize your work on police within a systemic analysis of the racialized impacts of policing. As an example, CFA has been engaged in anti-Black racism movement-building for years and contextualizes its work on campus police under that umbrella. They organize around a set of demands that centers anti-Black racism and includes issues beyond policing like relieving cultural taxation, valuing Black scholarship, and supporting Black and Africana studies and ethnic studies on campus. Similarly, the UVM UA Civil Rights Committee has led the union’s efforts on policing.
- Be prepared to respond to announcements from university leadership about changes in position and policy with a consistent message.

#### **5. Leverage existing chapter resources, staff, and leadership.**

The nature and extent of a campaign will be dependent on the availability of chapter officers, staff, and members. It may be possible to redirect some existing resources toward a campus policing campaign.

- Use typical sources of power and influence, including regular meetings with administration and input at board of trustee meetings. For example, the PSU-AAUP president regularly brings up Disarm PSU’s demands at weekly meetings with the university president and administrative staff and when speaking at trustee meetings.
- Consider what committees (for example, organizing, politics, social justice) might take on parts of the new campaign. Creating a new committee might enable you to activate members who feel especially motivated to address campus policing.
- Direct AAUP chapter staff to prioritize organizing around these issues, to host trainings and workshops, and to help organizing committees have one-on-one conversations with members.

#### **6. Utilize organizing actions.**

Whether the issue is winning a new collective bargaining agreement or changing campus safety policy, the greatest strength of AAUP chapters comes from their members. As independent faculty organizations, chapters are the faculty’s voice, and they should use that voice to speak truth to power. Organizing actions both through internal avenues like faculty senates and external pressure tactics like petitions and rallies are effective tools that can change the status quo. Chapters might consider starting with actions that draw from faculty expertise, such as senate resolutions or budgetary oversight, and then build momentum through more

confrontational actions as the campaign progresses.

- Build your chapter's power and collective voice.
- Put pressure on university decision makers through tactics such as letter writing, petition signing, speaking at board of trustees and leadership meetings, demonstrations and rallies, visual and artistic protests, boycotts and strikes, and media outreach. For example, AAUP leaders at University of Oregon and members of Disarm UO [published an op-ed](#) in the student-run newspaper [about the administration's decision to increase the size of the campus police department](#). Activists at many campuses have engaged in street theater, pickets, phone banks, and "banner drops" from pedestrian overpasses and upper floors of parking garages and other buildings in order to draw attention to campaigns for defunding and disarming campus police.
- Work with your faculty senate to pass university policies and resolutions.
- Engage in political activism at other levels, including about state and local policy.

## 7. **Assess and reassess your progress.**

As in any campaign, chapters should engage in ongoing collective reflection and make adjustments in their campaigns as necessary. Victory is never certain, of course, but chapters should have a clear benchmark for what constitutes progress and, ultimately, success. Possible questions for evaluating a campaign's progress include the following:

- Have you influenced decision makers?
- Have you built pressure?
- How are your members feeling about the campaign?
- What are possible next steps?
- How will you monitor ongoing implementation and accountability?

## **V. Conclusion**

Campus police forces are not immune to broader injustices in US law enforcement, and these injustices intersect with core AAUP concerns over shared governance and academic freedom. As the flagship organization of faculty in the United States, the AAUP insists that it is both appropriate and necessary for our chapters to work in coalition with other publicly minded groups to transform campus safety into something more just, accountable, and effective, up to and including reorganizing campus safety in toto. Although we believe the success of any given campaign to transform campus public safety ultimately rests at the chapter level, we conclude with specific suggestions for the AAUP national organization that will help constituent chapters mount such campaigns.

According to many of the AAUP chapter leaders interviewed for this report, one of the most important resources the national office provides is the moral authority attached to its statements, policies, and reports. Chapters can and do wield these documents in their efforts to transform their campuses. We suggest that the AAUP Council direct existing entities and

committees to make campus policing a focus of their efforts and work with staff to develop clear documentation that chapters can use in their own campaigns. For example, Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure might review some existing statements to see how policy regarding campus policing affects academic freedom. The Committee on College and University Governance (Committee T) may look at the AAUP's statements on governance and think about what role shared governance should have in promoting and overseeing campus safety for students, staff, and faculty. The Committee on Gender and Sexuality in the Academic Profession could look at the role of campus police with respect to violence and mistreatment of people on the basis of gender and sexuality. The Committee on Historically Black Institutions and Scholars of Color could look at issues concerning racism and campus policing. Finally, it may be appropriate for Council to request that several or all of the aforementioned committees work jointly to issue a general statement on campus safety that shows how all of these concerns intersect.

In addition to improving AAUP documentary materials, staff could develop specific resources to help chapters at all stages of an organizing campaign directed at transforming campus public safety. University finances are a perennial "black box" for most faculty, so the national office could support chapters by assisting their efforts to research administrative budgets and expenditures on police. Likewise, it is often difficult and intimidating for chapter leaders to reach out to other organizations or even their own members on such hotly contested political issues. The national office could develop a communications toolkit for chapter leaders on how to engage effectively with other organizations and their own members around issues of policing, and it could continue to highlight and publicize stories of chapters organizing on this issue. Finally, the AAUP's organizing staff could devote energy to developing resources and training members on how to build an issue campaign focused on transforming campus safety and integrating such demands into a collective bargaining context.

As the United States reckons with its racist past and present, we conclude with an emphasis that the AAUP is not immune from such scrutiny. As a majority-white organization, the AAUP has not been welcoming to our BIPOC colleagues, and organizational histories always affect the present. We commend the AAUP Council's recent commitment to transform the Association into an actively antiracist organization, and we implore our leaders to follow the excellent example of our members currently engaged in antiracist organizing work. As those chapter leaders interviewed for this report insist, organizing against campus police must always be connected to and intersect with antiracist goals. Confronting the racial history of the Association and maintaining focus on antiracist issues, including opposition to campus police forces, are two crucial steps toward realizing the AAUP's central mission: to ensure higher education's contribution to the common good.

## **Appendix A: Chapter Profiles**

These profiles are intended to provide additional insight into individual chapters that are prioritizing antiracist organizing at the center of their work, including the issue of campus policing. The included chapters were selected based on input from AAUP staff. This is not an

exhaustive survey, and the individual chapters are not representative of the wide range of AAUP chapters. Nevertheless, they offer some inspiration and guidance.

### **Profile 1. California Faculty Association (CFA)**

**Type and size of university:** The California State University system includes twenty-three diverse campuses across California. The campuses range in geographical area from urban to suburban to rural. The built forms of the campuses also vary, as do their relationships to their surrounding communities, their members' perspectives regarding campus security, and the number of BIPOC campus and community members.

**About CFA:** AAUP-affiliated CFA is the exclusive collective bargaining representative for California State University faculty, including tenure-track faculty members, lecturers, librarians, counselors, and coaches. See <https://www.calfac.org/about-cfa>.

**Status of police or security on campus:** Policing and security vary across the twenty-three campuses.

**About campus efforts toward disarming or divesting from police and investing in racial justice:** CFA's advocacy on policing and campus security is part of a multipronged campaign and a long-term movement. CFA released this statement, which discusses its rationale and demands to contest anti-Black racism: <https://www.calfac.org/pod/cfa-statement-anti-racism-and-social-justice-demands>.

One of CFA's specific demands is to

*Defund and Remove Armed & Militarized Policing from Campus: CFA demands that the CSU divest from its relations with police institutions throughout the state, defund campus policing, remove armed police from our campuses, and join CFA in exploring community-based strategies as alternatives to policing that are based in community accountability and transformative justice (c.f., <https://alp.org/programs/sos>).*

A network that consists primarily of faculty members, alongside students, is engaged in pushing the above demand, with the ultimate goal of police abolition. CFA's interest in policing grew out of a broader transformation project initiated around 2015, which pointedly addresses anti-Black racism and deals with militarized policing that regularly targets Black faculty, staff, and students, as well as other Black people. The activism has been heightened since 2020 and the media attention to the killing of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor, but CFA leaders emphasize that this is a long-term movement and not a moment.

- Besides individual campus-level efforts, CFA also uses its powerful advocacy through its statewide political-action committee and is considering introducing several different bills on police reform.



- In addition to its efforts on campus safety, CFA is also pushing for other changes to counter anti-Black racism and push racial equity, including advocating for Ethnic Studies AB 146, a state bill that would require students to take one ethnic studies course;
- Calling for the establishment and resourcing of Black and Africana studies departments and student centers
- Demanding an increase in financial and institutional investment in mental-health services and crisis-intervention teams instead of putting money into policing CSU campuses.
- Calling for free tuition for all Black, Native, and Indigenous students.

**Collaborations:** CFA has a student intern program across its campuses. Their central campaign right now is “Don’t Harm, Disarm.” The main message of that campaign is: “We want ALL students to feel safe on our campus. Instead of putting more money into more firearms and more officers on our campuses, our CSUs should be investing in proactive and preventative solutions, like more mental-health counselors and cultural centers for students.” See <http://csusqe.org/http-csusqe-org-no-harm-disarm/>

**Next steps and challenges:** A next step is further fact finding on what the budgets are to make analytic comparisons—for example, how CSU spending on Black and Africana studies compares to money spent on policing.

One significant barrier to address is that Black lives are not fully valued at California schools. Meanwhile, Black faculty, staff, students, and departments are under-resourced. CFA believes that unless it addresses this barrier, it won’t have real progress.

In terms of campus safety, one challenge is the wide range of perspectives on the issue. Even on a particular campus, there are some people working toward abolition, others toward defunding and demilitarizing, and still others serving on a reform committee that includes police officers. As a large body, CFA must do a lot of organizing to bring people into the movement who have different perspectives and different passions in the realm of social justice.

**Advice for other faculty unions:** CFA emphasizes the need for organizing to involve many people. In addition, it is critical to have a union-wide prioritization of values. CFA leaders believe that without the core set of values they established years ago, the union would not be able to engage deeply in this work. Having a core set of values and principles also enables the work to be sustainable without depending on specific individuals and to move beyond crisis response to more visionary activism.

**Thank you to:**

- Chris Cox (Sociology): CFA Associate Vice President, Racial and Social Justice–North/CFA Board of Directors; CFA Council for Racial and Social Justice Representative–San Jose; member, CFA Political Action and Legislative Committee
- Sharon Elise (Sociology): CFA Associate Vice President, Racial and Social Justice–South/CFA Board of Directors; member, CFA Contract Development and Bargaining

Strategy Committee; CFA Council for Racial and Social Justice Representative—San Marcos

- Charles Toombs (Africana Studies): CFA President/CFA Board of Directors, San Diego State University

## **Profile 2. Portland State University AAUP Chapter (PSU-AAUP)**

**Location:** downtown Portland, Oregon

**Type and size of university:** Portland State University is a public research university and urban-serving institution with more than 26,000 students and six thousand employees.

**Chapter basics:** PSU-AAUP is a collective bargaining chapter, with more than a thousand dues-paying members and a membership rate over 85 percent, including tenure-track and tenured faculty (TTF), non-tenure-track teaching faculty (NTTF), and academic professionals (APs).

**Status of police or security on campus:** In 2014, the (then new) board of trustees voted to transform its Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) into a sworn and armed police force, despite vocal opposition from many faculty, staff, and students. In fall 2020, Chief Haliburton and university president Stephen Percy announced that campus police will not carry firearms while on patrol. President Percy also committed to supporting a new Re-Imagine Campus Safety Steering Committee. As of March 2020, despite the announcement, most campus security officers are still wearing guns. The Re-Imagine Campus Safety Committee is meeting once per week, without any tangible changes yet.

**About campus efforts and campaigns toward disarming or divesting from police and investing in racial justice:** Disarm PSU is a grassroots coalition of students, staff, faculty, and community members and activists, which formed in 2014 in response to the decision to arm CPSO. The coalition has used a range of tactics, including interrupting then president Vim Vievels’s speech, vocal turnout at board of trustee meetings, a coordinated letter-writing campaign, sleep-ins, teach-ins, and block parties. In 2020, the coalition expanded its focus to be not just about disarming but also about broader efforts toward racial equity on campus and reimagining campus security.

**AAUP chapter role:** The PSU-AAUP chapter has been a visible and vocal supporter of the Disarm PSU campaign, mainly by sharing communication about the coalition’s efforts through the chapter’s major communication channels, engaging in ongoing dialogue with members, and using its “insider” status in communications with the university administration leadership. In 2014, about 70 percent of respondents to a survey of AAUP members indicated their opposition to arming campus police. In October 2018, the PSU-AAUP Executive Council sent a public statement acknowledging the killing of Jason Washington and calling for disarming to the PSU president and board of trustees. In November 2019, the PSU-AAUP Executive Council sent an [open letter to then interim president Percy](#) expressing disappointment with and requesting answers to serious questions about his [Campus Safety Plan](#). PSU-AAUP kept the [pressure on](#) in

summer 2020. Leaders also have been engaged in educating themselves and fellow members about defunding the police and abolition, not just on campus but more broadly. For example, the 2020 blog post [“Defunding the Police, What Does it Mean, and Why Does PSU-AAUP Support It,”](#) shared the chapter’s support for a campaign led by two local organizations, Portland African American Leadership Forum and Unite Oregon to shift \$50 million in Portland Police Bureau funding to other community efforts. In October 2020, PSU-AAUP member-leaders hosted a table at the Disarm PSU Block Party. Up through December 2020, the chapter president was consistently using communication channels to ask administration about the status and progress of disarming.

Not all PSU-AAUP members support the union chapter’s work on the Disarm PSU campaign. The chapter has been engaged in ongoing efforts to both understand the range of member viewpoints on the issue and to educate and build power. We recognize dissent as part of labor organizing. We try hard to honor differing viewpoints, while also articulating a vision of racial equity and listening most closely to our members of color and individuals from other systemically marginalized groups, as well as to students and campus community members. Our work on the Disarm PSU campaign has pushed our chapter to articulate more clearly our racial equity values, work we began to deepen in summer 2020 by engaging in a year-long contract with an equity-process designer.

**Progress and achievements to date:** The Disarm PSU Coalition sees recent announcements restricting use of arms by CPSO (mentioned above) as a significant but only partial win. For one thing, CPSO are still authorized to carry “less-than-lethal” weapons, including Tasers. Meanwhile, CPSO officers retain their status as a sworn police force and may still access firearms in some situations. As of early December 2020, officers were still seen on campus carrying firearms. University officials have communicated that the implementation of unarmed patrols was delayed since “Chief Halliburton is needing to rebuild the department with officers that are like-minded in their views on policing. . . . By way of demonstrating commitment, Chief Halliburton is already patrolling unarmed and the rest of the leadership team will begin unarmed patrols on Jan 1 [2021].” Another reason this is a partial win is that the decision falls short of Disarm PSU’s broader goals of a more equitable, just, and safe campus. The coalition has some optimism, as well as reservations, about the potential of the new Re-Imagine Campus Safety Steering Committee to steer transformative change.

**Next steps:** The Disarm PSU Coalition is continuing to build support for the following three Rs:

- **Reverse** the 2014 Resolution to employ sworn and armed officers.
- **Reinvest** in existing structures and create new investments to address historic racism and anti-Black violence at PSU.
- **Reimagine** what public safety at PSU looks like and recognize that safety means different things to different people.

This Disarm PSU Coalition, with support from PSU-AAUP, is also keeping pressure on the president and CPSO chief to be accountable to their summer 2020 announcements. As of January 2021, the Disarm PSU coalition was considering broadening its advocacy to be less of a

watchdog on the issue of disarming (which feels very politically constrained) and more of a visionary on the issues of campus safety, alternatives to policing, and racial justice, specifically addressing anti-Black racism.

**Advice for other union chapters:** Listen to BIPOC and other union members from oppressed communities or at extra risk of police violence. Use your communication tools and your relative power to ask hard questions, hold the university accountable, and fill committees with union members with clear racial justice values. Be willing to have difficult conversations with members who have a range of viewpoints. Articulate your values of racial equity and campus safety for all and build on those values.

**Profile 3.** University of Vermont United Academics (UVM UA)

**Location:** Burlington, Vermont

**Type and size of university:** The University of Vermont is a public land-grant university with more than ten thousand students. It is among the oldest universities and considered a “public ivy” university.

**Chapter basics:** United Academics is the AAUP-affiliated union representing over eight hundred part- and full-time faculty.

**Status of police or security on campus:** UVM Police Services is a sworn and armed police agency with statewide authority.

**Short summary of campaign towards disarming or divesting from police and investing in racial justice:** UVM United Academics has a Civil Rights Committee that has led the union’s actions on the issue of campus police. A subgroup from the committee sent a statement to the board of trustees and all senior administrators asking the administration to convert the campus police into a public safety office, publishing the statement on the union’s website and sharing it with members. The union subsequently has discussed doing a virtual teach-in.

Notably, a union member conducted a study several years ago on racial profiling by our state police, police department, and campus police that provides a research basis to prove racial profiling.

In this academic year, the union is trying to build momentum around the goal of conversion of the campus police force to a campus safety office.

**Involvement of other organizations:** Student groups have been active on the issue, particularly in summer 2020. A group of student activists conducted over three hundred interviews with BIPOC students, staff, and faculty members to collect accounts of racially charged incidents with our campus police. On Juneteenth, June 19, they sent an email to UVM administrators demanding that they abolish UVM police and cut ties with the Burlington Police Department

among other actions to protect students of color. They also met with the university's senior administrator, who didn't give any credence to the students' concerns about the campus police.

**Challenges:** In mid-summer, when a colleague posted educational material to support defunding the campus police in the union's discussion list, the union experienced pushback from some faculty members.

**Thank you to:** Yolanda Flores, PhD

*Campus Police Working Group*

Megan Horst (Urban Planning), Portland State University, chair

Michael Hames-García (Indigenous, Race, and Ethnic Studies), University of Oregon

Rudy Fichtenbaum (Economics), Wright State University

Michael Magee, AAUP staff

## Works Cited

- Addenbrooke, Stephanie, and Joey Ye. 2015. "After Thwarted Theft Attempt in Trumbull, YPD Arrests Intruder." *Yale Daily News*. January 25, 2015.
- Alexander, Michelle. 2010. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: New Press.
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP). 2015. *Policy Documents and Reports*, 11<sup>th</sup> ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Anderson, Melinda D. 2015. "The Rise of Law Enforcement on College Campuses." *Atlantic*. September 25, 2015.
- Armstrong, Amanda. 2015. "Securitization, Risk Management, and the New University." *Reclaim UC*. January 9, 2015. <https://reclaimuc.blogspot.com/2015/01/securitization-risk-management-and-new.html>.
- Benitez, Francisca. 2018. "Officers Drew Weapons on Student They Mistook for Suspect at the EMU." *Daily Emerald*. May 20, 2018.
- Bennett, Patricia Anne. 2012. "The Impact of the Structure, Function, and Resources of the Campus Security Office on Campus Safety." PhD diss., University of Nevada, Las Vegas.
- Blow, Charles M. 2015. "Library Visit, Then Held at Gunpoint." *New York Times*. January 26, 2015.
- Bonanno, Caitlin M., and Richard L. Levenson, Jr. 2014. "School Shooters: History, Current Theoretical and Empirical Findings, and Strategies for Prevention." *SAGE Open* January–March: 1–11.
- Calisch, Cam. 2020. "It's Time to Defund the University of Mississippi Police Department." *The Appeal*. <https://theappeal.org/defund-umiss-police/>.
- Cantor, David, et al. 2020. *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Misconduct*. Washington, DC: Association of American Universities.
- Cherney, Elyssa. 2018. "Shooting of University of Chicago Student Raises Questions Over Use of Force by Campus Police." *Chicago Tribune*. April 16, 2018.
- Cohen, Darryl T., Geoffrey W. Hatchard, and Steven G. Wilson. 2015. *Population Trends in Incorporated Places: 2000–2013*. Washington, DC: US Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, US Census Bureau.
- Crowe, Caitlin. 2018. "After Fatal Shooting by Portland State U. Police, Students Again Question Arming of Officers." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. September 26, 2018.

- Del Gandio, Jason. 2013. "Arrests and Repression as a Logic of Neoliberalism." *Counterpoints* 410: 3–14.
- Everytown for Gun Safety, the American Federation of Teachers, and the National Education Association. 2020. *Keeping Our Schools Safe: A Plan for Preventing Mass Shootings and Ending All Gun Violence in American Schools*. New York: Everytown for Gun Safety.
- Flaccus, Gillian. 2020. "Portland State Disarms Campus Police after Black Man's Death." *Washington Post*. August 13, 2020.
- Fox, James Allan, and Jenna Savage. 2009. Mass Murder Goes to College: An Examination of Changes on College Campuses following Virginia Tech. *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (10): 1465–85.
- Garcia-Rojas, Claudia, and Rosen, Charlotte. 2020. Get police out of schools-including university campuses. *Salon*. June 29, 2020.
- Gordon, Larry. 2011. "Bratton to Lead Investigation of UC Davis Pepper-Spraying." *Los Angeles Times*. November 23, 2011.
- Gurciullo, Brianna. 2013. "UPD Faces Flak for Off-Campus Responses." *GW Hatchet*. April 22, 2013.
- Harris, Lee, and Pete Grieve. 2018. "UCPD Officer Shoots U of C Student Wielding Metal Pole, Smashing Windows." *Chicago Maroon*. April 4, 2018.
- Herron, Elise. 2019. "Portland State University Pays Million Dollar Settlement to the Family of Jason Washington, Who Was Fatally Shot by Campus Officers." *Willamette Week*. December 31, 2019.
- Hinton, Elizabeth. 2016. *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime: The Making of Mass Incarceration in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hodge, Daniel White. 2013. "Policing College Campuses: Race, Social Control, and the Securitized of College Campuses." *Counterpoints* 410: 29–38.
- Hollister, Brandon A., and Mario J. Scalora. 2015. "Broadening Campus Threat Assessment Beyond Mass Shootings." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 25: 43–53.
- Inoue, Masamichi. 2020. "Between Surveillance and Sousveillance: Or, Why Campus Police Feel Vulnerable Precisely Because They Gain Power." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 49 (2): 229–56.
- Johnson, Cheryl Lero. 2017. "Preventing School Shootings: The Effectiveness of Safety Measures." *Victims & Offenders* 12 (6): 956–73.

- Kaeble, Danielle, and Mary Cowhig. 2018. *Correctional Populations in the United States, 2016*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Lankford, Adam, Krista Grace Adkins, and Eric Madfis. 2019. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 35 (3): 315–41.
- Lee, Michelle Ye Hee. 2015. “Does the United States Really Have 5 Percent of the World’s Population and One Quarter of the World’s Prisoners?” *Washington Post*. April 30, 2015.
- Linger, Keily. 2018. “Analysis of the Police Response to Mass Shootings in the United States between 1966 and 2016.” Honors thesis, College of Emergency Preparedness, Homeland Security, and Cybersecurity, University at Albany, State University of New York.
- Liptak, Adam. 2008. “Inmate Count in US Dwarfs Other Nations.” *New York Times*. April 23, 2008.
- Medina, Jennifer. 2012. “Campus Task Force Criticizes Pepper Spraying of Protesters.” *New York Times*. April 11, 2012.
- Murphy, Colleen. 2013. “Alumnus, Neighborhood Activist Demands Probe into UPD Practices.” *GW Hatchet*. October 23, 2013.
- Murphy, Kate, and Mark Curnutte. 2018. “University of Cincinnati Pays \$250k to Ex-Cop Who Killed Sam DuBose.” *Cincinnati Enquirer*. March 22, 2018.
- National Center for Campus Public Safety. 2018. *Campus Policing in an Urban Environment: Findings from a Forum on Critical Issues in Urban Campus Public Safety*. Williston, VT: National Center for Campus Public Safety.
- Patten, Ryan, Lucas Alward, and Matthew Thomas. 2016. “The Continued Marginalization of Campus Police.” *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*. 30 (3): 566–83.
- Pérez-Peña, Richard. 2015. “University of Cincinnati Officer Indicted in Shooting Death of Samuel Dubose.” *New York Times*. July 29, 2015.
- Planty, Michael, et al. 2016. *Female Victims of Sexual Violence, 1994–2010*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Powell, John W. 1994. “The Beginning—Yale Campus Police Department—1894.” *Campus Law Enforcement Journal* 24 (4): 2–5.
- Reaves, Brian A. 2008. *Campus Law Enforcement, 2004–05*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. *Campus Law Enforcement, 2011–12*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.



- Richie, Beth E. 2012. *Arrested Justice: Black Women, Violence, and America's Prison Nation*. New York: New York University Press.
- Ritchie, Andrea J. 2017. *Invisible No More: Police Violence Against Black Women and Women of Color*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Rocque, Michael. 2012. "Exploring School Rampage Shootings: Research, Theory, and Policy." *The Social Science Journal* 49: 304–13.
- Rodríguez, Dylan. 2012. "Beyond 'Police Brutality': Racist State Violence and the University of California." *American Quarterly* 64 (2): 301–13.
- Schwartz-Weinstein, Zach. 2016. "The Blue Blue Line, or, Towards a Critical History of the University Police." Paper presented at the American Studies Association annual meeting, November 19, 2016.
- Seidel, John. 2020. "Shooting of Student by University of Chicago Police Leads to Lawsuit." *Chicago Sun-Times*. March 25, 2020.
- Sloan, John J. 1992. "The Modern Campus Police: An Analysis of Their Evolution, Structure, and Function." *American Journal of Police* 11 (2): 85–104.
- Strong, Wesley. 2013. "Repression of Student Activism on College Campuses." *Counterpoints* 410: 15–27.
- Sulkowski, Michael L., and Philip J. Lazarus. 2011. "Contemporary Responses to Violent Attacks on College Campuses." *Journal of School Violence* 10: 338–54.
- Tobin, Michael. 2018. "UOPD and EPD Release Body Camera Footage of KWVA Radio Station Incident." *Daily Emerald*. July 23, 2018.
- Virginia Tech Review Panel. 2007. *Mass Shootings at Virginia Tech*. Richmond, VA: The Commonwealth of Virginia.
- Wiser, Bill. 1914. *Yale Memories*. New Haven: Tuttle, Morehouse, and Taylor.